

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

---

WILLIAM LAWLOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

BEMA POLYTECH, INC.

Defendant.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Case No. 08 C 568

Hon. Judge Leinenweber

Magistrate Judge Cole

**DEFENDANT’S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT**

NOW COMES, the Defendant, Bema Polytech, Inc. (“Bema”), by and through its attorneys, Richard J. Arendt and Elliott E. Petlak, and for its answer to Plaintiff’s Complaint, states as follows:

1. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of Plaintiff’s Complaint.
2. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of Plaintiff’s Complaint.
3. Defendant denies that it engaged in any employment practices which were unlawful.
4. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of Plaintiff’s Complaint.
5. No Paragraph 5 exists in Plaintiff’s Complaint.

6. Defendant admits that Plaintiff was employed by Bema Polytech, Inc., from March 1, 2007, through September 14, 2007. Defendant denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of Plaintiff’s Complaint.

6. Defendant has no personal knowledge of the matters contained herein and hence, neither admits nor denies same.

7. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of Plaintiff’s Complaint.

8. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

9. Defendant admits that Plaintiff was born on January 28, 1945. Defendant denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of Plaintiff's Complaint to the extent that they lead to any inference that the ADEA was violated.

10. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

11. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

12. Defendant admits that Plaintiff was and employee of Bema Polytech, Inc., from March 1, 2007, through September 14, 2007. Defendant denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

13. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

14. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

15. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

16. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

17. Defendants admits that Plaintiff filed a claim with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) at Chicago, Illinois, and that the EEOC issued a Right to Sue Letter at Plaintiff's request. Defendant denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

18. Defendant has no personal knowledge of the matters contained in Paragraph 18 of Plaintiff's Complaint and hence, neither admits nor denies same.

WHEREFORE, Defendant, Bema Polytech, Inc., denies that Plaintiff is entitled to judgment in any amount, whatsoever, against Defendant, Bema Polytech, Inc., and requests that

Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed, and such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

BEMA POLYTECH, INC.

By: /s/ Richard J. Arendt

Richard J. Arendt  
Elliott E. Petlak  
Law Office of Richard J. Arendt  
Attorney for Defendant  
640 N. LaSalle St., Suite 270  
Chicago, IL 60610-3783  
(312) 642-9606  
Atty.No. 0064823